

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

STERLING CONLEY HURT,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
V.	§	No. 3:19-cv-1722-K
	§	
MISSISSIPPI JOHN HURT	§	
FOUNDATION,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND
RECOMMENDATIONS AND TRANSFERRING CASE**

The United States Magistrate Judge made findings and conclusions in this case, recommending that the Court should *sua sponte* dismiss this action without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a), *see* Dkt. No. 6, and that Plaintiff’s motion to transfer this action to the Sherman Division of the Eastern District of Texas should be denied, *see* Dkt. No. 8 (collectively, the “FCRs”). Plaintiff filed objections, and therein moves the Court to transfer his action to Chicago, *see* Dkt. No. 9, which the Court construes as requesting a transfer to the Eastern Division of the Northern District of Illinois, in which Cook County is located, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 93(a)(1).

The District Court reviewed *de novo* those portions of the FCRs to which objection was made and reviewed the remaining portions for plain error. Finding none, the Court **ACCEPTS** both Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge. Dkt. Nos. 6 & 8.

But, for the reasons explained in the FCRs, because the Eastern Division of the Northern District of Illinois appears to be a proper venue for this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), the Court also **GRANTS** Plaintiff's motion to transfer this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1406(a) and 1631.

SO ORDERED.

Signed August 21st, 2019.


ED KINKEADE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE